



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/872,502	06/01/2001	Jason John Rutherglen	0104632-991110	1520
36716 7590 06/12/2007 LADAS & PARRY 5670 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD, SUITE 2100 LOS ANGELES, CA 90036-5679			EXAMINER BAUM, RONALD	
			ART UNIT 2136	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 06/12/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/872,502	<b>Applicant(s)</b> RUTHERGLEN ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Ronald Baum	<b>Art Unit</b> 2136	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 March 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-38 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-38 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

Art Unit: 2136

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is in reply to applicant's correspondence of 27 March 2007.
2. Claims 1-38 are pending for examination.
3. Claims 1-38 are rejected.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

The claims 1-38 U.S.C. 101 rejection is withdrawn.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

The claims 1-38 U.S.C. 112 rejection is withdrawn.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this

Art Unit: 2136

subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Van Watermulen et al, U.S. Patent 6,604,046 B1.

5. As per claim 1; "An apparatus for accessing data from a database through a security mechanism, the apparatus comprising:

a first application capable of

being executed on a client computer [ABSTRACT, figures 1-2 and associated descriptions, whereas the Java applet executed on the client ('first application') in support of the server request for (i.e., map data, etc.), through a typical Internet firewall ('security mechanism'), as broadly interpreted by the examiner.];

one or more proxy objects

being generated in response to

commands from the first application,

the proxy objects requesting

data from a database [ABSTRACT, figures 1-2 and associated descriptions, whereas the client generated proxy mapping objects ('first application generated proxy objects') in support of the server request for (i.e., database server data, etc.), through a typical Internet firewall ('security mechanism'), as broadly interpreted by the examiner.];

one or more drivers capable of

Art Unit: 2136

being stored on a server computer [ABSTRACT, figures 1-2 and associated descriptions, whereas the server servlet use of associated database access technology (i.e., ‘... map-data-access services pool 143 use relational database technology ...’), as broadly interpreted by the examiner.]; and

a second application capable of

being executed on a server computer

separated from the first application by a security mechanism,

the second application

receiving the proxy objects from the first application,

generating a database query based on the proxy objects and the drivers and

returning the database query results to the first application [ABSTRACT,

figures 1-2 and associated descriptions, whereas the Java applet executed on the

client (‘first application’) in support of the server request (and associated server

servlet (‘second application’) response to associated proxies generated, and

services supplied by the database drivers) for (i.e., map data, etc.), through a

typical Internet firewall (‘security mechanism’), as broadly interpreted by the

examiner.]”.

Further, as per claim 11, this claim is the method claim for the system (apparatus) claim 1 above, and is rejected for the same reasons provided for the claim 1 rejection, as such; “A method for accessing data located behind a security mechanism, comprising: executing a first application on a client computer that generates one or more proxy objects; communicating the

Art Unit: 2136

proxy objects to a second application on an application server; generating one or more database requests at the application server based on the proxy objects, the database requests being generating using database drivers; forwarding the database requests to a database; returning the data from the database to the application server; and providing the data back to the client computer using the proxy objects.”.

Further, as per claim 20, this claim is the system mean plus function claim for the system (apparatus) claim 1 above, and is rejected for the same reasons provided for the claim 1 rejection, as such; “A system for accessing; data located behind a security mechanism, comprising: a client having means for generating one or more database proxy objects in response to a database request; an application server comprising means for processing the received database proxy objects and means for using one or more: drivers to generate one or more database requests based on the database proxy objects; and wherein the client interacts with the database through the application server so that a security mechanism protecting the client does not interrupt the accessing of the data in the database.”.

6. Claim 2 ***additionally recites*** the limitation that; “The apparatus of Claim 1, wherein the first and second applications are

Java language applications.

The teachings of Van Watermulen et al suggest such limitations (i.e., ABSTRACT, figures 1-2 and associated descriptions, whereas the Java applet executed on the client (‘first application’) in support of the server request (and associated server servlet (‘second application’) response to

associated proxies generated, and services supplied by the database drivers) for (i.e., map data, etc.), through a typical Internet firewall ('security mechanism'), as broadly interpreted by the examiner.).

Further, as per claim 12, this claim is the method claim for the system (apparatus) claim 2 above, and is rejected for the same reasons provided for the claim 2 rejection, as such; "The method of Claim 11, wherein

the first and

second set of applications are

Java language applications."

Further, as per claim 21, this claim is the system mean plus function claim for the system (apparatus) claim 2 above, and is rejected for the same reasons provided for the claim 2 rejection, as such; "The system of Claim 20, wherein

the generating means and

the processing means are

Java language applications."

7. Claim 3 *additionally recites* the limitation that; "The apparatus of Claim 2, wherein the first application comprises an applet."

The teachings of Van Watermulen et al suggest such limitations (i.e., ABSTRACT, figures 1-2 and associated descriptions, whereas the Java applet executed on the client ('first application') in

Art Unit: 2136

support of the server request for (i.e., map data, etc.), through a typical Internet firewall ('security mechanism'), as broadly interpreted by the examiner.).

Further, as per claim 13, this claim is the method claim for the system (apparatus) claim 3 above, and is rejected for the same reasons provided for the claim 3 rejection, as such; "The method of claim 12, wherein

executing the first application further comprises

executing a Java applet."

Further, as per claim 22, this claim is the system mean plus function claim for the system (apparatus) claim 3 above, and is rejected for the same reasons provided for the claim 3 rejection, as such; "The system of Claim 21, wherein

the generating means further comprises

an applet."

8. Claim 4 *additionally recites* the limitation that; "The apparatus of Claim 3, wherein the second application comprises a servlet."

The teachings of Van Watermulen et al suggest such limitations (i.e., ABSTRACT, figures 1-2 and associated descriptions, whereas the Java applet executed on the client ('first application') in support of the server request (and associated server servlet ('second application') response to associated proxies generated, and services supplied by the database drivers) for (i.e., map data,



Art Unit: 2136

etc.), through a typical Internet firewall ('security mechanism'), as broadly interpreted by the examiner.).

9. Claim 5 *additionally recites* the limitation that; "The apparatus of Claim 4 further comprising

an application server that

executes the servlet."

The teachings of Van Watermulen et al suggest such limitations (i.e., ABSTRACT, figures 1-2 and associated descriptions, whereas the Java applet executed on the client ('first application') in support of the server request (and associated server servlet ('second application') response to associated proxies generated, and services supplied by the database drivers) for (i.e., map data, etc.), through a typical Internet firewall ('security mechanism'), as broadly interpreted by the examiner.).

Further, as per claim 14, this claim is the method claim for the system (apparatus) claim 5 above, and is rejected for the same reasons provided for the claim 5 rejection, as such; "The method of Claim 13 further comprising executing the second set of applications on the application server that process the proxy objects from the client computer, wherein the second set of applications comprises servlets."

Further, as per claim 23, this claim is the system mean plus function claim for the system (apparatus) claim 5 above, and is rejected for the same reasons provided for the claim 5 rejection,

Art Unit: 2136

as such; “The system of Claim 22, wherein the processing means further comprises a set of servlets.”:

10. Claim 6 *additionally recites* the limitation that; “The apparatus of Claim 5 further comprising

a database server that contains the data being accessed by the application server

wherein

the database server and

the application server are located in different geographic areas.”.

The teachings of Van Watermulen et al suggest such limitations (i.e., ABSTRACT, figures 1-2 and associated descriptions, whereas the Java applet executed on the client (‘first application’) in support of the server request (and associated server servlet (‘second application’) response to associated proxies generated, and services supplied by the database drivers) for (i.e., map data, etc.), through a typical Internet firewall (‘security mechanism’) in a multi-tiered (i.e., ‘... FIG. 1 is a block diagram of an exemplary multi-tiered spatial-data system ...’ whereas the middle tier/intermediate tiers are clearly the application tier(s) per se, and the Internet configuration of the network addresses the ‘different geographic areas’ aspects), as broadly interpreted by the examiner.).

Further, as per claim 15, this claim is the method claim for the system (apparatus) claim 6 above, and is rejected for the same reasons provided for the claim 6 rejection, as such; “The method of Claim 14 further comprising accessing the database using a 2 database server that

Art Unit: 2136

contains the data being accessed by the application server wherein the database server and the application server are located in different geographic areas.”.

Further, as per claim 24, this claim is the system mean plus function claim for the system (apparatus) claim 6 above, and is rejected for the same reasons provided for the claim 6 rejection, as such; “The system of Claim 23 further comprising means for storing the database that contains the data being accessed by the application server wherein the database server and the application server are located in different geographic areas.”.

11. Claim 7 *additionally recites* the limitation that; “The apparatus of Claim 6 further comprising

a communications network that permits

the client,

the application server and

the database server to communicate data with each other and

wherein the data communications between

the client and

application server occur using

the hypertext transfer protocol (HTTP) that

tunnels through the security mechanism.”.

The teachings of Van Watermulen et al suggest such limitations (i.e., ABSTRACT, figures 1-2 and associated descriptions, whereas the Java applet executed on the client (‘first application’) in

Art Unit: 2136

support of the server request (and associated server servlet ('second application') response to associated proxies generated, and services supplied by the database drivers) for (i.e., map data, etc.), through a typical Internet firewall ('security mechanism') in a multi-tiered (i.e., '... FIG. 1 is a block diagram of an exemplary multi-tiered spatial-data system ...' whereas the middle tier/intermediate tiers are clearly the application tier(s) per se, and the Internet configuration of the network addresses the '... hypertext transfer protocol (HTTP) ...' aspects, insofar as the WEB based use of HTTP, the associated port 80 use for WEB communications, and the WEB use of SSL/Ipssec security mechanisms when traversing the Internet through associated firewall(s)), as broadly interpreted by the examiner.).

Further, as per claim 16, this claim is the method claim for the system (apparatus) claim 7 above, and is rejected for the same reasons provided for the claim 7 rejection, as such; "The method of Claim 15, wherein the communications between the client computer and the application server uses the hypertext transfer protocol (HTTP) that tunnels through the security mechanism."

Further, as per claim 25, this claim is the system mean plus function claim for the system (apparatus) claim 7 above, and is rejected for the same reasons provided for the claim 7 rejection, as such; "The system of Claim 24 further comprising means for communicating between the client, the application server and the database server to communicate data with each other and wherein the data communications between the client and application server occur using the hypertext transfer protocol (HTTP) that tunnels through the security mechanism."

12. Claim 8 *additionally recites* the limitation that; “The apparatus of Claim 7, wherein  
the data communications between  
the client and  
the application server occur over port 80.”.

The teachings of Van Watermulen et al suggest such limitations (i.e., ABSTRACT, figures 1-2 and associated descriptions, whereas the Java applet executed on the client (‘first application’) in support of the server request (and associated server servlet (‘second application’) response to associated proxies generated, and services supplied by the database drivers) for (i.e., map data, etc.), through a typical Internet firewall (‘security mechanism’) in a multi-tiered (i.e., ‘... FIG. 1 is a block diagram of an exemplary multi-tiered spatial-data system ...’ whereas the middle tier/intermediate tiers are clearly the application tier(s) per se, and the Internet configuration of the network addresses the ‘... hypertext transfer protocol (HTTP) ...’ aspects, insofar as the WEB based use of HTTP, the associated port 80 use for WEB communications, and the WEB use of SSL/Ipsec security mechanisms when traversing the Internet through associated firewall(s)), as broadly interpreted by the examiner.).

Further, as per claim 17, this claim is the method claim for the system (apparatus) claim 8 above, and is rejected for the same reasons provided for the claim 8 rejection, as such; “The method of Claim 16, wherein the communications between the client and the application server occur over port 80.”.

Further, as per claim 26, this claim is the system mean plus function claim for the system (apparatus) claim 8 above, and is rejected for the same reasons provided for the claim 8 rejection, as such; “The system of Claim 25, wherein the data communications between the client and the application server occur over port 80.”.

13. Claim 9 *additionally recites* the limitation that; “The apparatus of Claim 8, wherein the one or more database drivers further comprise one or more JDBC drivers.”.

The teachings of Van Watermulen et al suggest such limitations (i.e., ABSTRACT, figures 1-2 and associated descriptions, whereas the Java applet executed on the client (‘first application’) in support of the server request (and associated server servlet (‘second application’) response to associated proxies generated, and services supplied by the database drivers (i.e., ‘... Exemplary RDBMSs include MS Access, SQL Server, Sybase, Oracle) Requests for this service include parameters such as viewing extent, map scale, map center, and the layers to be presented. These parameters are converted to SQL queries sent through JDBC connections to access and retrieve data from the RDBMS...’)) for (i.e., map data, etc.), through a typical Internet firewall (‘security mechanism’), as broadly interpreted by the examiner.).

Further, as per claim 18, this claim is the method claim for the system (apparatus) claim 9 above, and is rejected for the same reasons provided for the claim 9 rejection, as such; “The method of Claim 17, wherein the one or more database drivers further 2 comprise one or more JDBC drivers.”.

Further, as per claim 27, this claim is the system mean plus function claim for the system (apparatus) claim 9 above, and is rejected for the same reasons provided for the claim 9 rejection, as such; "The system of Claim 26, wherein the one or more database drivers further comprise one or more JDBC drivers."

14. Claim 10 *additionally recites* the limitation that; "The apparatus of Claim 6, wherein the application server further comprises
- means for batching one or more database requests from the client computer
- so that the batch of database requests are
- sent periodically to the database server."

The teachings of Van Watermulen et al suggest such limitations (i.e., ABSTRACT, figures 1-2 and associated descriptions, whereas the Java applet executed on the client ('first application') in support of the server request (and associated server servlet ('second application') response to associated proxies generated, and services supplied by the database drivers (i.e., '... Exemplary RDBMSs include MS Access, SQL Server, Sybase, Oracle) Requests for this service include parameters such as viewing extent, map scale, map center, and the layers to be presented. These parameters are converted to SQL queries sent through JDBC connections to access and retrieve data from the RDBMS...'), which is a batch transaction oriented aspect), through a typical Internet firewall ('security mechanism'), as broadly interpreted by the examiner.).

Art Unit: 2136

Further, as per claim 19, this claim is the method claim for the system (apparatus) claim 10 above, and is rejected for the same reasons provided for the claim 10 rejection, as such; “The method of Claim 15 further comprises batching one or more database requests from the client computer at the application server so that the batch of database requests are sent periodically to the database server.”.

Further, as per claim 28, this claim is the system mean plus function claim for the system (apparatus) claim 10 above, and is rejected for the same reasons provided for the claim 10 rejection, as such; “The system of Claim 24, wherein the application server further comprises means for batching one or more database requests from the client computer so that the batch of database requests are sent periodically to the database server.”.

15. As per claim 29; “A system [This claim is the method embodied software claim for the system (apparatus) claims 1-5,9 above, and is rejected for the same reasons provided for the claims 1-5,9 rejection] for accessing data by a Java applet wherein the data is located behind a security mechanism, the system comprising:

a client

that executes a Java applet having a series of instructions that includes

accessing data from a database,

the client further comprising

one or more database proxy objects that are

generated by the Java applet in response to a database request;



an application server  
that executes a servlet that interact with  
the database proxy objects and  
generates one or more objects corresponding to  
the database proxy objects,  
the application server further comprising  
one or more JDBC drivers that are  
integrated into the objects generated by the servlets  
wherein  
the JDBC drivers interface with a database so that  
the application server requests data from the database; and  
wherein  
the applet interacts with the database through the application server so that  
a security mechanism protecting the client  
does not interrupt the accessing of the data in the database.”.

16. As per claim 30; “A system [This claim is the method embodied software claim for the system (apparatus) claims 1,5 above, and is rejected for the same reasons provided for the claims 1,5 rejection] for accessing data located behind a security mechanism, comprising:

a client  
that executes a first application having a series of instructions that includes  
accessing data from a database,

the client further comprising  
one or more database proxy objects;  
an application server  
that executes one or more second applications that interact with  
the database proxy objects and  
have one or more corresponding objects,  
the application server further comprising  
one or more drivers that interface with a database so that  
the application server requests data from the database; and  
wherein  
the client interacts with the database through the application server so that  
a security mechanism protecting the client:  
does not interrupt the accessing of the data in the database.”.

17. Claim 31 *additionally recites* the limitation that; “The system of Claim 30, wherein  
the first and second set of applications are  
Java language applications.”.

The teachings of Van Watermulen et al suggest such limitations (i.e., ABSTRACT, figures 1-2 and associated descriptions, whereas the Java applet executed on the client (‘first application’) in support of the server request (and associated server servlet (‘second application’) response to associated proxies generated, and services supplied by the database drivers) for (i.e., map data,

Art Unit: 2136

etc.), through a typical Internet firewall ('security mechanism'), as broadly interpreted by the examiner.).

18. Claim 32 *additionally recites* the limitation that; "The system of Claim 31, wherein the first application comprises  
an applet."

The teachings of Van Watermulen et al suggest such limitations (i.e., ABSTRACT, figures 1-2 and associated descriptions, whereas the Java applet executed on the client ('first application') in support of the server request (and associated server servlet ('second application') response to associated proxies generated, and services supplied by the database drivers) for (i.e., map data, etc.), through a typical Internet firewall ('security mechanism'), as broadly interpreted by the examiner.).

19. Claim 33 *additionally recites* the limitation that; "The system of Claim 31, wherein the second set of applications comprises  
a set of servlets."

The teachings of Van Watermulen et al suggest such limitations (i.e., ABSTRACT, figures 1-2 and associated descriptions, whereas the Java applet executed on the client ('first application') in support of the server request (and associated server servlet ('second application') response to associated proxies generated, and services supplied by the database drivers) for (i.e., map data, etc.), through a typical Internet firewall ('security mechanism'), as broadly interpreted by the examiner.).

20. Claim 34 *additionally recites* the limitation that; “The system of Claim 33 further comprising

a database server that contains the data being accessed by the application server

wherein

the database server and

the application server are located in different geographic areas.”.

The teachings of Van Watermulen et al suggest such limitations (i.e., ABSTRACT, figures 1-2 and associated descriptions, whereas the Java applet executed on the client (‘first application’) in support of the server request (and associated server servlet (‘second application’) response to associated proxies generated, and services supplied by the database drivers) for (i.e., map data, etc.), through a typical Internet firewall (‘security mechanism’) in a multi-tiered (i.e., ‘... FIG. 1 is a block diagram of an exemplary multi-tiered spatial-data system ...’ whereas the middle tier/intermediate tiers are clearly the application tier(s) per se, and the Internet configuration of the network addresses the ‘different geographic areas’ aspects), as broadly interpreted by the examiner.).

21. Claim 35 *additionally recites* the limitation that; “The system of Claim 34 further comprising

a communications network that permits

the client,

the application server and

the database server to communicate data with each other and  
wherein the data communications between  
the client and  
application server occur using  
the hypertext transfer protocol (HTTP) that  
tunnels through the security mechanism.”.

The teachings of Van Watermulen et al suggest such limitations (i.e., ABSTRACT, figures 1-2 and associated descriptions, whereas the Java applet executed on the client (‘first application’) in support of the server request (and associated server servlet (‘second application’) response to associated proxies generated, and services supplied by the database drivers) for (i.e., map data, etc.), through a typical Internet firewall (‘security mechanism’) in a multi-tiered (i.e., ‘... FIG. 1 is a block diagram of an exemplary multi-tiered spatial-data system ...’ whereas the middle tier/intermediate tiers are clearly the application tier(s) per se, and the Internet configuration of the network addresses the ‘... hypertext transfer protocol (HTTP) ...’ aspects, insofar as the WEB based use of HTTP, the associated port 80 use for WEB communications, and the WEB use of SSL/Ipssec security mechanisms when traversing the Internet through associated firewall(s)), as broadly interpreted by the examiner.).

22. Claim 36 *additionally recites* the limitation that; “The system of Claim 35, wherein  
the data communications between  
the client and  
the application server occur over port 80.”.

The teachings of Van Watermulen et al suggest such limitations (i.e., ABSTRACT, figures 1-2 and associated descriptions, whereas the Java applet executed on the client ('first application') in support of the server request (and associated server servlet ('second application') response to associated proxies generated, and services supplied by the database drivers) for (i.e., map data, etc.), through a typical Internet firewall ('security mechanism') in a multi-tiered (i.e., '... FIG. 1 is a block diagram of an exemplary multi-tiered spatial-data system ...' whereas the middle tier/intermediate tiers are clearly the application tier(s) per se, and the Internet configuration of the network addresses the '... hypertext transfer protocol (HTTP) ...' aspects, insofar as the WEB based use of HTTP, the associated port 80 use for WEB communications, and the WEB use of SSL/Ipssec security mechanisms when traversing the Internet through associated firewall(s)), as broadly interpreted by the examiner.).

23. Claim 37 *additionally recites* the limitation that; "The system of Claim 36, wherein the one or more database drivers further comprise  
one or more JDBC drivers."

The teachings of Van Watermulen et al suggest such limitations (i.e., ABSTRACT, figures 1-2 and associated descriptions, whereas the Java applet executed on the client ('first application') in support of the server request (and associated server servlet ('second application') response to associated proxies generated, and services supplied by the database drivers (i.e., '... Exemplary RDBMSs include MS Access, SQL Server, Sybase, Oracle) Requests for this service include parameters such as viewing extent, map scale, map center, and the layers to be presented. These parameters are converted to SQL queries sent through JDBC connections to access and retrieve

Art Unit: 2136

data from the RDBMS...')) for (i.e., map data, etc.), through a typical Internet firewall ('security mechanism'), as broadly interpreted by the examiner.).

24. Claim 38 *additionally recites* the limitation that; "The system of Claim 34, wherein the application server further comprises
- means for batching one or more database requests from the client computer
- so that the batch of database requests are
- sent periodically to the database server."

The teachings of Van Watermulen et al suggest such limitations (i.e., ABSTRACT, figures 1-2 and associated descriptions, whereas the Java applet executed on the client ('first application') in support of the server request (and associated server servlet ('second application') response to associated proxies generated, and services supplied by the database drivers (i.e., '... Exemplary RDBMSs include MS Access, SQL Server, Sybase, Oracle) Requests for this service include parameters such as viewing extent, map scale, map center, and the layers to be presented. These parameters are converted to SQL queries sent through JDBC connections to access and retrieve data from the RDBMS...'), which is a batch transaction oriented aspect), through a typical Internet firewall ('security mechanism'), as broadly interpreted by the examiner.).

***Conclusion***

25. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from examiner should be directed to Ronald Baum, whose telephone number is (571) 272-3861, and whose unofficial Fax number is (571) 273-3861 and unofficial email is Ronald.baum@uspto.gov. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Thursday from 8:00 AM to 5:30 PM.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nasser Moazzami, can be reached at (571) 272-4195. The Fax number for the organization where this application is assigned is **571-273-8300**.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. For more information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Ronald Baum

Patent Examiner

NASSER MOAZZAMI  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

  
617107

